of Wordsworth, Milton and of Blake; in the village Hamp-dens and in those obstreperous persons who, in order to watch over their democratic rights, make miserable the lives of chairmen of committees. From John Ball, William Langland, Sir Thomas More and the Chartists to men like Tom Mann$_3$ Charles Kingsley, some of the great Quakers and many of the young writers of to-day, there is a note of rebelliousness which, rather ironically in our time, cries, "Britains never shall be slaves.[5]' The English are far more revolutionary than many care to admit, and the history books are often more concerned with kings and generals than the defenders and apostles of liberty.

But there is another strand in English history, which has given her the name of the "nation of shopkeepers" and the paragon of *bourgeois* hypocrisy. It lies in the capacity to express the noblest sentiments and yet to extract the greatest advantage out of any situation. Stalin said in an interview to an American journalist that the British capitalists were the most elastic in the world. There is, however, behind the coldness of the British temperament a deep emotional element and there has been more than one occasion in history when the mass of Englishmen said, "Be damned to it! W^{T}e won't stand for this!" A good example of this was the mass indignation over the Hoare-Laval Pact not so long ago. This blend of idealism and commercialism is strikingly illustrated in India. The British could not prevent Indians reading English history., and, as we have seen, the educational policy created rather than assuaged the national freedom movement. What is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander, and Indians, too, came to feel that they should never be slaves.

The quotation from Sir Thomas Munro well illustrates the liberal tendency in the British, and he is not an isolated example. A readiness to apply the same standards to India as